

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1							
2				Land Exchange Online Suyrvey Results as of 4/5/2016			
3							
4	What is your overall view of the proposal?	Did the information provided on the City website and video address your concerns?	If not, what concerns do you have?	What else should we be considering in this effort?	Zip Code	Name	Email
5	neutral						
6	very-supportive						
7	very-supportive	yes		Move forward		non-member 19	opted out
8	unsupportive	no	Keeping the land owned by the city	Dropping the swap		non-member 24	opted out
9	unsupportive	no	Strawberry Fields is too great of a piece to trade away for the proposed parcels	Abandon the deal		non-member 27	opted out
10	very-supportive	yes	The proposal widens access beyond the local neighborhood. The Broadmoor should be held accountable to keep its development plans compatible to the site.	This is a rare opportunity to provide public access and to consolidate previously inaccessible property		non-member 34	opted out
11	very-supportive	yes				non-member 35	opted out
12	very-supportive	yes		On balance this is very good for open space and trail access. Good work!		non-member 40	opted out
13	unsupportive	no			80906	non-member 44	opted out
14	unsupportive	no	Prevention of future development.	How are you going to stop all the flies from the horses from ruining my barbecue?	80906	non-member 49	opted out
15	very-supportive	yes		Place high emphasis on 1) continuous and fully connected Chamberlain and Cheyenne Mtn. Heritage Trails, and 2) secured public access to the two peaks (Muscoco Mtn. and Mt. Cutler)		non-member 37	opted out
16	very-supportive	yes		The exchange benefits people from all over the city and county, while opposition to the exchange comes from a very small localized group living close to Strawberry Hills.	80920	non-member 55	opted out
17	unsupportive	no	Video too long and confusing to view entire	Who is conducting this survey, the City or the Broadmoor? It is very difficult to leave comments in this small space. All proposed improvements are vague, "may" and other non committal terminology. City needs to maintain the mountain backdrop and open space of Strawberry Fields. Are you sharing these results with the Broadmoor? Part of the city's Master Plan is to preserve open space and mountain backdrop and that is being ignored for Strawberry Fields. There is no definition of the scope of fundraising activities that would occur. But affects on wildlife and the community are being ignored. This space is locked in by homes, the canyon, Seven Falls and mountain backdrop. It has reached its threshold of intrusion. Seven Falls is lovely but increased traffic and usage has already negatively affected the tranquil neighborhood. If there would be fundraisers what about noise and toilets and traffic? Horse damage to land? The City having to micromanage every activity the Broadmoor wants to do on the property? Fire risk? Noise from fire pit cowboy sing alongs? There are WAY too many unknowns. But ultimately, this space should not be sold to anyone...it should remain in the hands of the public for public use and access. By looking at the maps, the original parcel looks to be intended for public use, not commercial. The city's responsibility is to keep open space, not trade it away for less valuable, monetarily and for wildlife preservation. The city needs to be creative in coming up with additional trail plans WITHOUT the Strawberry Fields piece. Suspicious that it's "all or nothing" pitting groups against one another. We love our open spaces! Sorry about the rambling but the format for these comments is ridiculous.	80906	non-member 60	opted out
18	unsupportive	no	Privatization and development in N Cheyenne Canon	Eliminate the Strawberry Fields portion of the land swap	80906	non-member 67	opted out
19	unsupportive	no	Prime park land traded for land without access	conditional use permit rather than deed	80906	non-member 69	opted out
20	unsupportive	no	Ownership of public resource by for profit private company	Preserving parks and not swapping for unequal value land (without access)	80906	Michael Chaussee	4u@actionmatrix.com

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21	unsupportive	yes	The broadmoor doesn't need strawberry fields and the incline is already open to the public.	Citizens! Screw what the broadmoor wants.	80909	non-member 71	opted out
22	very-supportive	yes		Zoning of the land transferred to the Broadmoor	80903	non-member 73	opted out
23	very-supportive	no	1. The 189.5 acre property transferring from the City to the Broadmoor in South Cheyenne Canon MUST include a public right-of-way for the Old Stage Road! Maps do not show that to be the case. 2. The North Cheyenne Canon exchange should include a corridor for the trail from Daniels Pass to Greenwood Park and a parcel that includes all the ruins in Greenwood Park itself. The ruins at Greenwood Park are of potential historic significance. (see the Pikes Peak Atlas south of Daniels Pass) In 1888 Bertha E. Bourne, the widow of Amos H. Bourne, first filed for a 160 acres homestead which included what would become Greenwood Park. She was issued a patent on 18 September 1894. It was Frederic R. Smith, a Colorado Springs banker who developed most of the builds that now lay in ruins at the site, probably in the 1920s. Mr. Smith gave the name Greenwood Park to the development. It should be made available for public visitation and study. The Green Settlement, also seen on the PP Atlas, consists of 2 log cabin ruins, now nearly obiterated, could yield useful historic information about the area. It lies on the trail to Greenwood Park and should also be included in the corridor.	See above	80904	non-member 75	opted out
24	unsupportive	no	Everything is slanted as if the exchange is all about benefit and gain for the city. Biased and manipulative.	The Strwaberry Field area is unique, but more, already part of the park.	80906	Joleen Thompson	joleecolorado.thompson@gmail.com
25	neutral	yes			80920	non-member 78	opted out
26	unsupportive	no	I use the Strawberry Fields propery regularly as part of an extended mountain bike ride. It has far more dollar and recreational value than the offered exchange properties. I do not support the swap in ANY way.	The city should listen to the residents of the greater Colorado Springs area. The community does NOT support this move. The Broadmoor should go back to the drawing board and place their riding stable adjacent to the golf course or other already developed land, not try to wow the community with worthless swaps.	80906	non-member 77	opted out
27	neutral	yes	test	test	test	non-member 80	opted out
28	unsupportive	no	Additional attractions in area (riding stable) will challange already taxed parking. when 7 falls went to Broadmore they eliminated parking at the venue causing users to fill all spaces SE Cheye. around picnic areas.	If you get the parking right it looks like a great idea.	80905	non-member 81	opted out
29	unsupportive	no	The land swap is not even close in terms of what most of the public would actually access. Strawberry filelds is easily accessed by all people....not just hikers and outdoor enthusiasts.. The Incline, Barr trail and much of the other land proposed to be aquired in the swap are able to be accessed by realativly few. Horse manure in our streams is a concern, additional traffic in Cheyenne canyon. Private ownership of public land that should stay PUBLIC!! No idea what the Broadmoor may decide to do with the land years down the road...whatever they want I would imagine.	The good of the public verses the desire of a very powerful private entity. Once this land is "given away in my opinion" we don't get it back. The broadmoor already has stables if I am correct and they can work out something with other local stables if they really need to appease the tourists. Please don't put tourists desire for a horse ride above the people that actually live here!	80906	non-member 83	opted out
30	unsupportive	no	Future developments on Strawberry Hills, how big is the picnic venue	What liability does the City absorb by owning the Incline and Barr Trail	80905	non-member 82	opted out
31	unsupportive	no	I am not in favor of giving our land to the Broadmoor		80906	non-member 84	opted out

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
32	unsupportive	no	The materials focus on what is gained and not on what is lost. Seems like Parks has made up its mind that its a good idea and is focused predominantly on the benefits. Would appreciate an unvarnished perspective and hard analysis on what is being sacrificed as well as what's being gained at the individual parcel level.	Economic, environmental and social impacts to the property being sacrificed and indirect impacts to the surrounding community should be analyzed and shared with the community. The lack of specificity here renders an informed decision impossible. Seems to be a blind spot in the analysis. Seems like Parks' and Broadmoor's excitement for the exchange has caused a blind spot or perhaps a purposeful spin job. This builds mistrust between the citizen group "losers" and the City and Broadmoor who are excited for the exchange. Also, analysis should be shared showing whether TOPS funds can be used to achieve the same result without using the 189 acres as "currency". The City should consider the recent Gazette editorial as totally lacking in indendence and, quite possibly, purposefully putting a positive spin on the exchange (Broadmoor and Gazette are related parties). No analysis of the "do nothing" scenario has been offered which seems to be missing from the conversation. Failure to publish data and analysis surrounding economic, environmental and social considerations gives rise to the notion of missed items of importance and/or hidden agendas - efforts should be made to enhance transparency into these considerations and bring equal focus to the negative impacts along with the positives. Parks' 1/14/16 announcement stated a clear excitement to partner with the Broadmoor and to do the deal while failing to mention the required sacrifice, like it wasn't even worth mentioning. This apparent lack of concern and unbalanced announcement has unnecessarily created a "189-acre-loving citizens" vs. "Parks & Broadmoor" conflict. Effort to remove the Parks/Broadmoor posturing resulting from the 1/14/16 announcement should be considered, especially since the Broadmoor has impacted its "corporate neighbor" status with its controversial road closure and Bear Creek stables proposals. That's all immediately comes to mind. Additional considerations will undoubtedly arise as transparency into the exchange is brought forth.			
33	unsupportive	no	No to swapping Strawberry Fields	Start over	80906	non-member 85	opted out
34	very-supportive	yes		Allow residential hiking access to upper Strawberry Hills from the Alta Vista side.	80906	non-member 87	opted out
35	very-supportive	yes			80906	non-member 91	opted out
36	very-supportive	yes	None, the City Parks staff did a great job negotiating on our behalf.		80903	non-member 92	opted out
37	unsupportive	no	I oppose giving away any land in North Cheyenne Canon Park	Nothing.	80906	non-member 94	opted out
38	somewhat-unsupportive	yes	Knowing exactly what we are giving up in strawberry field land. Why has the city not developed trails into the center of this property already?	Consider leasing a small portion of North Cheyenne Canon Park to the Broadmoor (much like whats done in Palmer Park and Garden of the Gods) in exchange for easments on Barr Trail	80906	non-member 99	opted out
39	unsupportive	no	Strawberry fields is more accessible and more useable than the proposed trade parcels	Beyond dollar value & size of land, then incline swap adds very little to the public, Chamberlin extensions south are worthless unless an agreement with the zoo can be reached before the deal is made.	80918	non-member 101	opted out
40	unsupportive	no	What will the land use plan be and when will it be released? What will the size of operation (number of horses) be, and will that be limited forever?	More input from users, groups like Friends of Cheyenne Canon, Medicine Wheel, Trails and Open Space Coalition	80906	non-member 102	opted out
41	unsupportive	yes		Alternatives to perhaps allow for a stable but also allow the park to maintain current city park (leasing option).	80903	non-member 105	opted out
42	unsupportive	no		The value of something is more than it's square acres and monetary worth. The Strawberry Fields area provides access for many, not the few.	80906	non-member 108	opted out
43	unsupportive	no	why the rush on this "backdoor" deal? no appraisal information available, no wildlife impact study available,	why do I care what the Broadmoor should do? This is public owned land the people of Colorado springs and the colorado springs city council should be the ones talking!!!!	why do you need this?	non-member 109	opted out
44	unsupportive	no	am voting again I just cleared my cookies	creating a legit survey? Read your emails and social media it's more reliable then this survey!!	0	non-member 110	opted out
	unsupportive	no	not sure how many times I should vote as I am beyond OPPSED TO THIS Land GIVE AWAY with the Broadmoor	Not sure why I can what the Broadmoor thinks! This is an issue between the Colorado Springs community and the Colorado Springs City Council, parks programswe should be having the discussions not the Broadmoor and Parks, Recreation and Culture heads!!!!	social media!	non-member 111	opted out

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
45	unsupportive	no	How did you plan to use this information from the survey?	Not sure why I need to care what the Broadmoor thinks! This is an issue between the Colorado Springs Citizens and the Colorado Springs ELECTED Officials, City Council etcwe should be having the discussions not the Broadmoor and Parks, Recreation and Culture heads!!!!	social media!	non-member 112	opted out
46	unsupportive	yes		The city needs to consider most of the land being gained by the city is not valueable. The parcel along 21st St. for example does not really gain the city much, Bear Creek is already a large tract of open space in that area.	80904	non-member 113	opted out
47	unsupportive	yes			80906	non-member 115	opted out
48	unsupportive	no	The city is well aware of the flaws concerning the manitou incline and is with holding the information from the public. the city has no business obtaining land, the city is supposed to be closing the manitou incline. if the land where the incline and the barr trail sit ever changes hands, it should go to the forest service, not the city	see #3	80919	non-member 116	opted out
49	somewhat-unsupportive	no	Continued access to Cheyenne Canon	This is land belonging to the people of CS. The Broadmoor needs to look elsewhere -	80906	non-member 118	opted out
50	unsupportive	no	Im concerned that the city is traded prime, usable, close in open space for remote, difficult to access open space with few trails	The broadmoor should consider using some of it's currently owned and extensive land holdings to build it's stable project	80906	non-member 117	opted out
51	unsupportive	yes		stopping it	80917	non-member 119	opted out
52	unsupportive	no	No to Strawberry Fields	Redo deal excluding Strawberry Fields.	80920	non-member 120	opted out
53	unsupportive	no	This survey is bogus	Take out Strawberry Fields	80920	non-member 121	opted out
54	very-unsupportive	no	This survey is bogus #2	Your answers don't match in your results....and I'm taking this again for the since time in a minute on my phone	80920	non-member 129	opted out
55	very-unsupportive	no	This survey is bogus #3	Taking it again for the 3rd time in a minute	80920	non-member 130	opted out
56	very-unsupportive	no	This survey is bogus #4	I could just sit and do this all day long.	80948	non-member 132	opted out
57	very-unsupportive	no	Why Strawberry Fields needs to be included in deal? What other options have been considered? Restricted access to public land owned by city for 130 years. Poor format of information to public. City support/ TOSC support before any public input. Flawed survey. This one is a joke: not quantifiable; not a representative sample; able to take survey multiple times.	The city should be concerned about protecting public space already owned by public. It shouldn't even be up for negotiations. The city should put citizens first, not a for profit company. And this is such a horrible format for a survey, typing in a small box, nothing quantifiable. What happened to T OSC survey?	80906	Rachel Rocks	rachrocks@mac.com
58	unsupportive	no	Private ownership of Strawberry Fields.	Remove Strawberry Fields and find another way to acquire the land the City wants. Encourage Anschutz to do a deal where he just donates land he will never use, out of the goodness of his heart, and for the betterment of the area....in exchange for nothing. He can write it off...and get the benefit of the exceptional goodwill of donating unusable land to the hotel to the public.	80906	Don Dahlgren	dd@bunited.com
59	very-unsupportive	no	Who asked who for the landswap? Did the City of Colorado Springs elected official go to the Broadmoor or did the Broadmoor come to the City of Colorado Springs? Will there be a third party appraisal of the lands in question completed? What other options have been considered to gain the trails that the City wants from the Broadmoor? The questions go on and on....my last one is why have no City Council members returned my email directly? I have written a few very pointed concerns and other citizens that have written have been personally emailed back?	I am still confused by this question (I took the first really bad survey yesterday)? The Broadmoor should consider not taking an " all or nothing" position. The Broadmoor should walk away from "the effort"...it is public land not for sale. The Broadmoor has no say in this conversation in the first place. If the Broadmoor has land to sell the City can use the increased taxes approved by voters a few years ago for trails and open spaces improvements /purchases such as these. The City should consider talking to the people before talking to private for profit groups about land deals!! Finally the City needs to listen to the citizens.	Voting District 3	lara rowell	springrowells@gmail.com
60	very-unsupportive	no	Confusing maps, confusing deal. Broadmoor gets the good, accessible land, and the city gets remote parcel and easements. Wasn't there a trade with the National Forest and Emerald Valley that was giving the Barr Trail access? How can the Broadmoor be trading this again? Public open space needs to stay public!! NOT on a fee basis. NO to this deal!	The wildlife should be considered and the effect of more tourist activity in an area of town already experiencing overabundance of traffic from Seven Falls and the Zoo. What about increased pollution and the erosion caused by horses?	80906	emily rocks	rocksrnj@msn.com
61	very-unsupportive	no	Clarity of positions, appeared one-sided		80903	Kerry Whitmore	kwhitmore554@yahoo.com
62	somewhat-unsupportive	no	The Stawberry Hills neighbors will be negatively impacted.	Plan to put their stable & horse experience further up in the hills. What is wrong with that? The hotel is in a residential area. If they want to have an expanded use - they need to do it elsewhere.	80906	non-member 174	opted out
63	very-unsupportive	no			80906	Judy Sellers	judysell@aol.com
64	very-unsupportive	no	public land for private use	purchase land. use land already owned.	80918	non-member 239	opted out

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
65	very-unsupportive	no	City park land should remain as city park land	The City should lease 7-9 acres in Strawberry Fields to the Broadmoor. The Mt. Muscoco land won't be used by most hikers, and the Broadmoor is not going to disallow access to the incline and Barr Trail -- that would be SO unpopular!!	80906	Paul Connaughton	pconnagt@yahoo.com
66	very-unsupportive	yes			80906	non-member 268	opted out
67	neutral	yes			80906	non-member 272	opted out
68	very-unsupportive	no	no no no	stop it	80906	renee brindisi	reneebrindisi@gmail.com
69	very-unsupportive	no	The importance of open space to the welfare of people has not been addressed, nor the biodiversity of the area. Many people have moved to the springs because of the open space in their chosen communities. This is being taken away from us.	The citizenship. This is a citywide issue, what is being taken away from the citizens of the Broadmoor opens the door to any part of the city. This is a citywide problem. If we take away the reasons people move to Colorado Springs how will we ever get business' to ever move here. There is a much bigger problem for the future of Colorado Springs.	80906, BUT this is a citywide issue.	Linda Randono	lrandon@comcast.net
70	somewhat-supportive	yes			80922	Bill Reed	wrrsends@gmail.com
71	very-unsupportive	no	The swap isn't equitable.	The effort the residents of this city have placed into developing Strawberry Fields.	80905	non-member 331	opted out
72	very-unsupportive	no	An acreage comparison is not at all representative of what we would be losing here.	The city needs to realize the true value of the strawberry fields area is far in excess of technical trail terrain.	80906	Paul Stabnow	pstabnow@gmail.com
73	somewhat-unsupportive	yes		I am concerned about the preservation of Strawberry Fields in our peaceful canon. The land was originally donated by Stratton with the intent that it would remain a park. The proposal to trade land and to use zoning restrictions to limit development, in my mind, is too weak of a tool to ensure the land's protection as open space. I believe that the property must be either leased with restrictions or traded along with a conservation easement that reflects the public's wishes. If these restrictions are not in place, I believe that the deal should not be authorized.	80906	Tom Roemer	bikeroemer@gmail.com
74	very-unsupportive	no	Too many to list!	Keep Strawberry Fields out of the equation. Use taxpayer money to secure the Incline. Mt. Muscoco lands will never be developed. Forget it. Have the Chamberlain Trail go through the Broadmoor Resort.	80906	Michelle Mason	mtnlions@aol.com
75	very-unsupportive	no			80829	Sarah Brown	sarahbrowncaddy@gmail.com
76	neutral	yes	Can we get back the terrain maps that show elevation. they were there a couple days ago	Alright, you know everyone loves the meadows of Strawberry Fields. Can't a compromise be to keep the northeast part of Strawberry Fields in the northeast corner and let the Broadmoor have the 7 acre building area where Mesa Avenue intersects with S Cheyenne Canyon Road?	80907	Chris Roberts	chris9702l@gmail.com
77	somewhat-supportive	no	I would like to be assured that the Chamberlain Trail alignment will not just follow adjacent roads through Strawberry Hills and will explore much of the property like the current maps show.	I think the city needs an east/west trail corridor through the Strawberry Hills property that would access Old Stage Road. This would allow a hiker to travel to Hully Gully without having to walk on Old Stage Road for much of the trip. It could also use one of the scenic canyons on the property.	84058	Curt Wursten	curtis_wursten@hotmail.com
78	very-supportive	yes			80906	J B McCoy III	jbmccoy@comcast.net
79	somewhat-unsupportive	no	trading good public land for bad	Broadmoor already confiscated the brand name of the Stable at the Broadmoor up	80906	non-member 415	opted out
80	very-unsupportive	no	Future change in Broadmoor ownership would likely affect some of the promised intent. There have been 3 recent owners of the Broadmoor: El Pomar, Gaylord, and Amschutz. Each ownership has had significant impacts on the Broadmoor as a business as well as its relationship to the community...	Accessible open space is an important public asset. One can take a grandchild or grandparent to Strawberry Fields but not the land above and beyond Mt Cutler (Mt Muscoco/Daniels Pass)	80906	Rick Meinig	rickmeinig@gmail.com
81	very-unsupportive	no	THAT STRAWBERRY HILLS WILL BECOME A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT!	THE LAND IS OWNED BY THE CITIZENS AND THE PROPOSALSHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO A VOTE OF THE CITIZENS OF COLORADO SPRINGS.	80906-4202	Mel Eskanos	meleskanos@msn.com
82	very-supportive	yes			80906	Cathy Railton	crailton@springsgov.com
83	very-supportive	yes			80906	non-member 447	opted out
84	very-unsupportive	no	What happens when Anschutz sells the Broadmoor?	Zoning & deed restrictions are easily changed and cannot be relied upon.	80906	Joel Gazibara	joelgazibara@yahoo.com
85	somewhat-unsupportive	no	development restrictions required	a master plan by Broadmoor for Strawberry Hill	80918	non-member 488	opted out
86	very-supportive	yes		Don't listen to the astroturfers. You're getting smeared unfairly in social media.	80906	non-member 492	opted out

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
87	somewhat-unsupportive	no	I am concerned that the driver for this effort is the Broadmoor acquisition of the strawberry fields open space. This is a fundamental change of a quiet part of the neighborhood into a business that will impact negatively the whole neighborhood, not just the folks across the street from it. This part of the park is a neighborhood jewel and should not be turned into a business.	This end of town is long established. Recent Broadmoor proposals like this have uniformly been negative in their impacts on people in the neighborhood. They need to respect their neighbors more.	80906	non-member 502	opted out
88	somewhat-supportive	yes	I was at the 2/11/16 hearing. Access to Broadmoor trails at Strawberry would only have meaning if Broadmoor built the trails. Also, Strawberry Fields is a "well kept secret" for it's wealthy neighbors. I was there 2/10/16 and not a single sign that it was a city open space. Not very egalitarian. This has to change! The soft snow showed evidence of some foot traffic in the preceding week but not as much as I expected given the comments of the neighbors about how much they used the park.	Trading away beautiful land that has been public for 130 years just seems wrong. Would there be a way that the city could provide a longterm lease to allow a stable at SF but retain land ownership and build its own trails? And then have a similar reciprocal deal to protect Barr Trail and the Incline?	80907	Steve Driska	stevedriska@mac.com
89	very-unsupportive	no	Previously submitted.	Social values	80906	Alan Hale	alan_hale@yahoo.com
90	very-unsupportive	no	Strawberry fields should be kept out of the swap and retained as public park	The feelings of the constituents in 80906 neighborhood	80906	kathy wade	prettydogdaisy@gmail.com
91	very-unsupportive	no	The number of access roads that will need to be constructed in order to provide the stables with necessary services. Also, the number of stalls in the stable and the projected plumbing/electrical needs of the site. Also, the plan for removal of manure from the site.		80906	non-member 593	opted out
92	very-unsupportive	no	Impact on wildlife resources	I have complete distrust of the Broadmoor, plus I do not wish to see free pedestrian access to Strawberry Fields closed forever. It will become accessible only to wealthy patrons of the Broadmoor....City is overwhelmingly emphasizing active recreation: trail running and fitness, mountain biking, ice climbing, while neglecting wildlife-watching, less active hiking. What about handicap accessibility to acquisition lands? No natural heritage information to gauge impact on wildlife, wildflowers, other natural resources.	80916	Eric Eaton	bugeric247@gmail.com
93	very-supportive	yes			80903	Matthew Driftmier	mhdraft@gmail.com
94	very-unsupportive	no	That this deal has already been done and now the city is just trying to make a bad idea palatable.	Do not sell Strawberry Fields. If you do please consider removing the term preservation in T.O.P.S. mission statement. Maybe create a Go Fund Me page for the incline, its popularity extends beyond the Springs Area.	80106	chris bowman	sionnach333@yahoo.com
95	very-supportive	yes			80916	non-member 621	opted out
96	very-supportive	yes			80906	Karen Brandner	kbbrandner@msn.com
97	somewhat-supportive	yes		Broadmoor to provide in detail how thet, annually will care for the land that is outside the area of stables and picnic area	80906. My home is one of 4 homes that border the property 189.5 acres	lee wolf	leewardwolf@comcast.net
98	very-unsupportive	no	This deal is moving too fast. It needs to slow down. A survey or study should be done on the impact of horses, like a commercial stables, needs to be done, What will the impact of a herd of horses do to the quality of the water in the canyon? What does a Boutique stables mean? how many horses?	If this deal goes through there will be only North Cheyenne Canyon open to the public. All the other canyons in our city are privately owned. The Broadmoor does not need to commercialize this piece of land.	80906	Denise Eckstein	c22eckstein@comcast.net
99	very-supportive	yes			80905	non-member 649	opted out
100	very-supportive	no	If they do have a stable-where will the horses be allowed? In Cheyenne Canyon?	Horses ruin trails.	80916	Linda Watkins	linnie81@hotmail.com
101	somewhat-unsupportive	no	if acquired the zoning can be changed. also we should never privatize public land.	purchase land from broadmoor. tops? broadmoor already has more than enough land for these needs.	80918	non-member 665	opted out
102	very-unsupportive	no	Strawberry Fields should under no condition be privatized.	Broadmoor is large enough. It should cease expanding at the expense of residents.	80906	Charles Rollman	crollman@comcast.net
103	very-unsupportive	no	the city has paid over 2 million to maintain private land NOT good stewardship of the people's money	Broadmoor needs to donate land or sell NO SWAP	80906	jon rowell	jrowell9@gmail.com

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
104	somewhat-supportive	yes			80922	Jason Arnold	gurrenzero00@gmail.com
105	very-unsupportive	no	Too many to list here. If the city says it cannot afford the costs of upkeep, then how will they pay to keep up all the additional acreage? Oh, because it's not going to be accessible or usable? Then it's not worth swapping!	This is already our public land; keep it that way. Also consider the additional environmental impact made for tourists and issues surrounding the stable. This is a bad move; it stinks of corruption.	80906	non-member 700	opted out
106	very-unsupportive	no	#NAME?	Ensuring public access to public properties the city currently owns and the broad moor wants...	80919	Ca Nelson	cnelson149@gmail.com
107	very-supportive	yes	my only concern is with the meeting attendees who are opposed to the land swap. Their rude, negative behavior in unwarranted. They display an extremely ignorant and classless attitude.		80906	non-member 739	opted out
108	very-unsupportive	no	Why the rush? What protections are really in place to protect Strawberry Hill/meadow from development, noise and other polution and keep the land wild as was the intent of the voters who purchased the city for the use of the citizens.	Work the swap or purchases without Strawberry Hill and meadow. Ask voters to provide funds to take care of the area.	80906	non-member 749	opted out
109	very-unsupportive	yes	I am against the land swap.	Forget about it.	80903	non-member 755	opted out
110	very-unsupportive	no	Please consider what seniors and not just millennials when considering usage of facilities!	Interaction of people and bicycles with horses on trails. Both seen to "wander".	80922	Richard Barron	lumberjack383@centurylink.net
111	very-supportive	yes		Get it done!	80906	John Murphy	jpmmurphy@aol.com
112	very-supportive	yes			80905	Krista Heinicke	krista12170@live.com
113	very-supportive	yes			80906	Shauna Hawkins	shaunakhawkins@gmail.com
114	very-supportive	yes			80906	David Palenchar	dpalenchar1@msn.com
115	very-supportive	yes			80831	non-member 857	opted out
116	very-unsupportive	yes	This is a lose-lose giveaway.	Broadmoor should consider placing the stable on their own property	80919	non-member 868	opted out
117	very-supportive	yes			80906	Teresa Dombroski	wydombroski@hotmail.com
118	very-supportive	yes			80903	non-member 873	opted out